



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

JASTROW'S "STUDY OF RELIGION."

The Study of Religion. By MORRIS JASTROW, Jun., Ph.D., Professor in the University of Pennsylvania. London, Walter Scott; New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901. 16mo, pp. xiv, 451. 6 \$. (The Contemporary Science Series.)

So many persons are now interested in the historical study of religion, that a good book on the subject is sure to meet with a hearty reception; and to such a reception Professor Jastrow's volume is well entitled. Its purpose and scope differ from those of other works of "introduction." We have several admirable descriptions and discussions of social and psychological religious phenomena: the *Manuel* of Chantepie de la Saussaye, with its details (in the two editions) of the lower and the higher faiths; Jevons's attractive exposition of the stadia of religious development; Tiele's discussion of the elements of religious belief in his Gifford Lectures; to which may be added the material brought together by Max Müller in his Gifford volumes. Jastrow's object is to set forth the proper method of studying religion, and the relation of the science of religion to other allied sciences. The literature of the subject, which is extensive, is handled by him with ease; he writes out of a full mind, with clearness, force, and sympathy, and his volume ought to secure the end he has in view, namely, to recommend the historical study of religion to all educated classes in the community.

The material is divided into three parts. The first, "General Aspects," deals with the history and nature of the study of religion, the classification of religions, the character and the definitions of religion, and the origin of religion. The second, "Special Aspects," discusses the relation of religion to ethics, philosophy, mythology, psychology, history, and culture. The third, "Practical Aspects," points out the proper attitude of mind in the study of religions, the necessity of going to original authorities, the desirableness of introducing the historical study of religion into colleges, universities, and theological schools, and the value of museums as an aid to the student. Two Appendixes describe the programme of the Section of History of Religions in the Paris *École des Hautes Études*, and the

arrangement of the Musée Guimet. Finally a valuable selected bibliography is given, and an index. The historical survey in the first chapter is intended not only to exhibit the steps by which the study of religion has reached the position of a science, but also to enforce the proper method of study. The ancients, the author points out, concerned themselves very little with the investigation of alien cults; the Greeks alone—and they only to a limited extent—showed interest in the subject; it is, however, proper to observe that the spirit and methods of Herodotus, Plutarch, Pausanias, and the author of the *De Syria dea* are not bad, and that, under favourable conditions, these writers would probably have produced valuable works. Dr. Jastrow then traces the development in Christianity—the intolerance of the middle period, when all other religions were regarded as beneath notice—the dogmatic hostile naturalism of the English deists, followed by the scepticism of the eighteenth century—the appearance of a broader and more sympathetic view in Spinoza, Lessing, Herder, Hegel, Carlyle and others—and finally (through the discovery of the great Eastern religions, and the growth of the historical spirit) the rise of the modern science, represented by Max Müller, Tiele, Réville, Tylor, Robertson Smith, Frazer, Jevons, Chantepie de la Saussaye, and others, and in magazines (the *Paris Revue de l'histoire des religions* and the *Tübingen Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*) and museums. To the nineteenth century is due the credit of having established the correct method of the study of religions—full and careful collection of material, and sympathetic and unbiassed interpretation of the facts.

The difficult question of the classification of religions is discussed by Dr. Jastrow at length; he reviews the various schemes proposed, and gives his own. In the course of the discussion he mentions certain considerations that are of general interest. Thus, he points out the difference between types of religious faiths and phases of religion. There are stages of belief through which all communities, or in some cases all civilized communities, pass; animism appears to be universal in certain stadia of culture, and is, besides, not a religious faith but a scientific creed—a basis of religion, but not itself religion; magic and ancestor-worship exist or have existed everywhere in the world; the conceptions of the deity as manifesting himself in nature and in history (regarded by Max Müller as distinguishing the Aryans and the Semites respectively) are found among all cultivated peoples, and, in germinal form, even among savages; monotheism, which to many seems a satisfactory differentia, is a tendency rather than a distinctive creed—it is the goal toward which all cultivated society moves. Those things, then, Jastrow

concludes, cannot in themselves be regarded as valid distinguishing marks of religions. He insists, further, that there is a disposition to lay too great stress on race as a factor in social development: not only is it hard to define the term "race" (we know of no community of unmixed blood), but it is true that peoples of different ancestral origin will, under similar external conditions, develop similar mental characteristics. In this statement he is doubtless right, but it must also be admitted that, if we take "race" in the sense of a unitary social agglomeration, racial tendencies are important factors of growth—the differences between Hebrew and Hindoo, or between Chinese and Greek, are real and effective; and unity may be imposed on a mixed community by a single element, as in the United States (an illustration cited by Dr. Jastrow), where the motley mixture of nationalities is dominated and coerced by the Anglo-Saxon spirit. The caution against putting undue emphasis on racial divisions is timely; but there seems to be no objection to recognizing an old Semitic type and an old Greek (or perhaps West-Aryan) type of religion, and perhaps some others. Another remark of Professor Jastrow's, that no great religion stands as the representative of a single idea, may be heartily endorsed; the life of a civilized community, of which its religion is one expression, is too complicated to be reduced to a single element. Finally, Jastrow accepts, without discussion, the view, held by most recent writers (Mr. Andrew Lang is an exception), that there has been in general a steady advance, intellectual and moral, in the religious life of the world as a whole, and in the religious experience of every separate community. On the basis of these principles he passes judgment on the current systems of classification. It is a pleasant illustration of his sympathetic attitude that he has a friendly word for the impossible (but once popular) division of religions into true and false: even from the historical point of view, he remarks, such a division has a certain value, in so far as it recognizes a development of religious thought—a forward and a retrograde movement. As specimens of philosophical classifications he takes those of Hegel and Hartmann¹, and rejects them for the reason that they attempt to characterize each religion by a single idea or salient point. Hegel's historical outlook is limited—he does not consider Buddhism, Mazdeism, or Islam; and, for the rest of the civilized world, it is obvious that, in defining the Greek religion as the religion of beauty and freedom, the Roman as that of organization, and the Hebrew as that of majesty, while his conception is original and attractive, he does not reach the

¹ Schelling's scheme also is interesting. There are some excellent remarks on the general subject in H. Schultz's *Alttestamentliche Theologie*.

essential features of these faiths. Hartmann had the advantage of a better knowledge of the historical facts; but Dr. Jastrow finds his division of religious types into naturalistic and supranaturalistic unsatisfactorily vague, though acute and magnificent; thus Hartmann (following Hegel) makes the Greek religion the aesthetic refinement of naturalistic henotheism; certainly it may be said to be this, but it is something more. Max Müller's classification on the basis of language is now generally abandoned. Kuenen's division into national religions and universal religions (taking "universal" to mean "adapted to all times and places") brings out an important point (the non-local elements in certain religions), but puts into the background higher ethical and other resemblances: in this classification Christianity stands alongside of Buddhism and Islam, and apart from Judaism. The similar division into religions with and those without an individual founder is rejected by Jastrow for the reason that it lays the stress on a relatively unimportant point; all religious progress is due largely to individuals, and no individual is more than the organizer of already existing conceptions. Tiele, in his article "Religions" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, after criticizing other schemes, offers an elaborate classification of his own into Primitive Naturalism, Animism, National Polytheistic Religions, Nomistic Religions, and Universal Religions. The objections to the inclusion of animism and universal religions are mentioned above, and Jastrow further objects to this classification that it is inexact in that, for example, national polytheistic religions, having religious and civil codes, may also be classed as nomistic. Later, in his Gifford Lectures, Tiele so far modifies this scheme as to lay the principal stress on the division into the two main types, nature-religions and ethical religions—in the former of these types divine beings are not regarded as acting in accordance with ethical considerations. This general division, Dr. Jastrow holds, is valuable, yet hard to carry out consistently; thus, the Greek and Roman religions, which Tiele puts into his first class, must be regarded as ethical. Similar difficulties appear in Réville's classification into polytheistic and monotheistic, the former including animistic and fetishistic cults, national mythologies (China, Egypt, Babylonia, Greece, Rome, Germany), and legalistic religions (Brahmanism, Mazdeism, Confucianism, Taoism, Buddhism), and the latter Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (though the emphasis put by Réville on legal organization is a valuable point). Raoul de la Grasserie (in his *Des Religions comparées*, &c.) enumerates twenty-two proposed classifications, all of which are set aside by Jastrow as open to one or another of the objections above stated. His own classification is

based on the view that the highest form of religion is that in which there is complete accord between religion and life, and of such accord he distinguishes four grades: the religions of savages, in which the cult is meagre, and the superhuman powers are approached only in times of peril; the religions of primitive culture, characterized by animism, magic and ancestor-worship, and by an incipient union between religion and life, in which, however, there being little religious organization, large sections of life (such as marriage and the training of children) are omitted; the religions of advanced culture (India, Babylonia, Egypt, China, Greece, Rome), with powerful priesthoods and good general religious organization, so that a considerable proportion of the acts of life are in direct contact with religion; and finally, the religions that emphasize as an ideal the coextensiveness of religion with life (Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam). It must be admitted that this classification, which its author sets forth with great force and persuasiveness, avoids many of the faults of its predecessors, and is attractive by its simplicity and breadth. Abandoning the attempt to fix on any one doctrine or usage as a *nota*, it distinguishes religions by their degrees of intellectual and moral culture—that is, by the culture of the communities by which they are professed. Religion is thus treated as one element of general human culture, having of necessity close relations with all other elements. Dr. Jastrow remarks that all schemes of classification are beset with difficulties, and his own, well thought out as it is, suggests some questions. One is surprised to find Islam put higher in the scale than the religions of Greece and Rome. We must compare the highest forms of these religions—the cult of the populace is equally mechanical and non-spiritual in both—and in such a comparison Plato does not fall below Mohammed, or Plutarch, Agricola and Tacitus below the Calif Omar I; the general ethical level was higher in Greece and Rome than it has ever been in purely Moslem lands. Possibly the difficulty lies in the somewhat indefinite expression “the co-extensiveness of religion with life.” This cannot be meant to indicate a condition of things in which there is outward recognition of the deity in every act of life, for it is precisely the lower forms of faith that are outwardly the more observant of religion. It must mean a purer and more strenuous ethical life, and in that case, putting aside dogma and creed, we cannot, in accordance with Dr. Jastrow’s general view, put any religion as a whole into any one category, but must always specify time and place; the Christianity of the Spanish peasant does not differ materially from the religion of the Greek peasant of Aristophanes’ time; the mediaeval robber

baron is not to be compared with Epaminondas; in the Christian church of Corinth in Paul's day there were practices that no respectable club now would permit for a moment. If conduct be the test of excellence, the important thing for a religion is not how far it enters into life, but what sort of life it enters into. Religion never creates a system of morals, nor is there discoverable any relation of cause and effect between the intellectual and ethical conceptions of a given religion and the morals of its adherents. These both spring from certain social conditions, and therefore coexist in a given community. The fact seems to be that wherever there is religion there is a union of religion and life (so Jastrow, on p. 167); religions differ among themselves not in the extent but in the nature of this union. Thus, in respect of rationality and ethical power, religions may be ranked according to the degrees of culture of their communities; any religion, whatever its creed, is at any moment what its adherents make it. Within this general scheme there may be cross-divisions, based on such conceptions as the immanence or the transcendence of the deity, the organization of religious law and worship, the nature of sin and the plan of salvation. It is a great merit of Dr. Jastrow's discussion that it shows the futility of the current attempts to establish an all-embracing classification of religions.

The chapters on the character and origin of religion give full and judicious discussions of these points. Modern writers are substantially at one as to what is meant by "religion," and there will be no objection, except, perhaps, in the case of one expression, to the definition adopted by Jastrow: the natural belief in a Power or Powers beyond our control¹, on which we feel ourselves dependent, this sense of dependence leading necessarily to the establishment of relations between man and the extra human Powers; it may be well to add that religion proper is nothing but this sentiment, all dogmas, creeds, and ethical codes being the product of science or philosophy. The chapter on the origin of religion criticizes the various views on the subject, and accepts that of Max Müller and Tiele. In this discussion it would be well to distinguish between theories of origin proper and theories of earliest forms. In the latter category belong the theories that make animism, or the worship of ancestors or ghosts, or totemism, the starting-point of religious development; these do not touch the question of the psychological basis of religion—they merely state the phenomena that first called

¹ The words "beyond our control" exclude certain forms of magic, which, in the opinion of some writers, are really forms of religion; for these words we might substitute "extrahuman."

into consciousness, and were systematized by, the universal human instinct. Here also we must place the views that religion was created by a supernatural divine revelation, or that it is a device of priests to get control of the masses. The unsatisfactory character of such explanations is fully demonstrated by Dr. Jastrow—animism, ancestor-worship, and totemism are simply early forms in which the religious sense expresses itself. Religion, Dr. Tylor well says, is the belief in spiritual beings, and animism is the groundwork of the philosophy of religion, that is, the starting-point of religious, dogmatic, and ritualistic construction. The ultimate basis of religion is man's belief in an extrahuman Power that it behooves him to cultivate. In regard to the accuracy of the expression "the sense of the infinite" (adopted by Müller, Tiele, and Jastrow), opinions will differ; it is unnecessary to quote the criticisms made on the phrase. Probably all will agree that early man has a sense of something beyond and above him, and that this something later develops into the infinite; and the question whether this germinal sense is the sense of the infinite appears to be chiefly one of words. The determination of the origin of this sense is the task not of the history of religions, but of psychology and philosophy.

Part II of the volume deals with one of the most interesting of the questions connected with religion, namely, its relation to other lines of thought. The fact is recognized that religion and ethics are two entirely different developments, and the history of their affiliation is traced; ethical codes are created by experience, and are adopted by religion, which acts as a stimulus of moral life. In the earliest known period, Dr. Jastrow holds, ethics and religion stand quite apart from each other, then came into close union (in the cultivated religions), and later, under the influence of scientific and philosophic thought, the union is dissolved. As to this, I should prefer to say that the union between religion and ethics becomes more and more rational and spiritual: in the lowest cults religion accepts and guards the current system of morals (which may be low and mechanical), and in the highest (in the most advanced modern forms, for example) the union of religion and morality appears to be closer and more refined than ever before. So, one may doubt whether progress in religious organization entails loss of individualism (p. 217)—on the contrary, in religion, as in commerce, politics, and science, the more organization the more individualism; and in fact Jastrow seems to say this on the preceding page. He proceeds to point out how various problems (as the conceptions of God, sin, salvation) involved in religion have been taken up by philosophy, and how mythology is an appeal to man's emotional

nature and a conservative force; or, as it may be otherwise put, both philosophy and mythology belong in the category of science—both attempt to account for the world, human and extrahuman, and thus to supply a framework for the religious sentiment. He calls attention to the value of recent physiological-psychological investigations (by Wundt, Starbuck, and others), which undertake to determine the character of certain psychic phenomena—not merely visions, hallucinations, and the like, but all inward experiences, normal and abnormal (conversion and the religious emotional life generally); religious psychology must deal, indeed, with the whole history of man—the science is still in its infancy. It is obvious that religion is closely bound up with general history and culture, is in fact one element of these; and, among other things, Jastrow has admirable remarks on the so-called conflict between science and religion—a conflict historically real, but philosophically unreal.

Part III is a commendation of the historical study of religion, for the sake of culture and in the interests of religion itself. A comprehension of its nature and history, it is urged, must increase its power. The attitude of the student must be sympathetic without being vague and vacillating; he must recognize and endeavour to understand the various tendencies of human thought and the differing demands of diverse temperaments, and, at the same time, must have his own opinion, based on the probabilities of the case. If he be a Moslem, fully convinced of the truth and superiority of his faith, he must have his eyes open to what is true and praiseworthy in Buddhism; if he be a philosopher, standing above all religions, he must search for what is rational in all; Jews and Christians, Protestants, Romanists, and Greeks must be not inimical but hospitable each communion to the others. This is the only scientific attitude. Further, Jastrow insists, the student must go to the original authorities, and not judge any religion till he has studied its documents in the original tongue; Christians too much neglect the Talmud, and Jews the New Testament. It is not possible for one man to master all religions, but he may make himself familiar with one or two, and so acquire a sound critical method and a certain capacity of insight in dealing with religions for whose materials he must depend on the testimony of other men. The volume closes with an earnest plea for the prosecution of the historical study of religions in colleges, universities, and theological schools; the feasibility and desirability of such study is shown, and a programme is sketched. Well-constituted faculties of the new science have been established in France and Holland, and a beginning in this direction has been made in America. It is the business of universities, Dr.

Jastrow remarks, to conduct investigations in the history of religions; there can be no doubt that the establishment of chairs for this purpose in all higher schools of learning would promote the cause of religion and of general culture. No subject has a greater claim on society than the study of the paths by which mankind has reached its present position in regard to the relation between man and God. The details, including the establishment of museums (like the Musée Guimet in Paris), might be worked out by every university or college for itself.

This outline of Professor Jastrow's book by no means does justice to the fullness and suggestiveness of its contents; but it may serve to commend the volume to the attention of those who are interested in furthering the historical study of religions.

CRAWFORD HOWELL TOY.

Harvard University.

DALMAN'S NEW DICTIONARY.

ערוך החריט, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*, bearbeitet von Dr. GUSTAF DALMAN, Teil II, pp. 181-447, Frankfurt-a.-M., 1901. Kauffmann.

AFTER an interval of four years, Dr. Dalman has given us the second half of his Dictionary, and thus completed a scholarly, concise, and handy work. The great merit lies in its handiness, since it offers in one volume of moderate size all that the student requires for preparatory work, and is, at the same time, a lucid and reliable guide. For this reason its strictly alphabetical arrangement is a commendable feature, whilst its completeness is such, that it also deals with corrupted words for which the usual uncritical reprints of Targums and Rabbinic writings are responsible. As regards etymological research, the book will not, and is not meant to, supplant the existing larger works; but it offers much material for corrections of the same, especially in the way of vocalization. There is no doubt that, from this point of view, Dr. Dalman's book marks a progress over its predecessors. Considering the complex nature of the language to be dealt with, consisting of various Aramaic dialects, Aramaicisms in Hebrew words, Hebraisms in Aramaic words, foreign words, the fixing of vowels is a very arduous undertaking. The present condition of the printed Targums (with the exception of a few critical editions lately published) has been too long a source of dissatisfaction to the reader. This also applies to quotations from the